DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 848 RC 012 127

AUTHOR Tate, Enid Smith
TITLE A Perspective on Reading Skills for the Individual Migrant Child.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 69p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperation; Educational History; Educational Objectives; *Federal Legislation; *Migrant Education; Migrant Problems; Outreach Programs; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Skills; *State Programs; *Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act; Florida Language Arts Tutorial Program; *Migrant Student Record Transfer System; National Migrant Education Program; New York Tutorial Outreach Program

ABSTRACT

For the migrant child, mobility disrupts the continuity and sequencing of reading skills instruction and makes the maintenance of adequate progress records very difficult. A study, covering the years from 1965 to 1979 and tracing the development of selected approaches to providing continuity in reading progress, begins with a description of the effects of the Elementary Secondary Education Act and its amendments and includes a history of the development of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS). The report includes a description of the National Migrant Education Program's codification of reading skills, an attempt at the simplified transmittal via MSRTS of information regarding a child's reading progress. The study notes various definitions of reading and reading skills and describes usual methods of skills assessment and remediation. The trend during the 14 years studied toward individualized tutorial programs is described. Two such programs in effect in states in the Eastern Stream of migration, Florida's Language Arts Tutorial (LAT) program and New York's Tutorial Outreach Program (TOP), are compared on the basis of rationale, goals, students served, staff, training, and evaluation, and are used to demonstrate the positive effect of interstate cooperation on the continuity of reading instruction for the migrant child. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188848

A PERSPECTIVE ON READING SKILLS FOR THE INDIVIDUAL MIGRANT CHILD

BY

ENID SMITH TATE

[1980]

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Enid S. Tate

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC 012127

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

America has long been regarded as a nation of individuals who can not be characterized as belonging to any one race, color, or creed. Individuals who do not share a common cultural background, who appear in various hues of white, yellow, black, and red can not be expected to think alike or to learn in the same way. It is important for teachers to remember that the children who come to learn are also individuals. As Karlin (1975) states, "How to provide for individual differences in reading ability is one of the most difficult problems teachers face" (p. 354).

It was necessary to tailor reading instruction to needs more than fifty years ago as interviews with teachers who had taught in rural one-room schools in the 1920s confirmed (Ribovich, 1978). The abilities of children in those classrooms might span all eight grades. The usual practice was to keep all students in the reading class of their grade. Ribovich's interviews showed that teachers helped children experiencing reading problems individually as time permitted, and assigned extra reading to more able students.

As America became an increasingly urbanized society rural schools closed. The depression of the 1930s sent many

farm families on the road to seek work in the fields harvesting crops. By 1951 the President's Commission on Migratory Labor estimated that there were "a million migratory workers" (Greene, 1954, p. 1) in the United States.

Economic necessity forced many of the children of migrant farm workers to join their parents in the fields moving from place to place as the seasons demanded. The migrant lifestyle differed from that of other school children. Sutton (1960, p. 73) found that diverse backgrounds and irregular attendance required teachers to provide individual instruction in reading for the migrant children.

Purpose

The study was designed to trace the development of selected approaches to provide continuity in reading progress for individual children who have unique needs as migrants. The study was not intended to be a comprehensive review of all educational programs for migrant children in reading. It was confined to the states in the Eastern Stream Region of the United States because those states have attempted to meet the needs for continuity of instruction through planned interstate cooperation. The period of time covered began with the enactment of federal legislation for disadvantaged children in 1965 and ended with the completion of the codification of reading skills for the National Migrant Education Program in 1979.

Problem and Significance of the Study

The mobility of the migrant child disrupts the continuity and sequencing of reading skills needed for a basic education. It presents the related problems of recording progress and the exchange of student records that are unique to the migrant school population. A study of selected efforts to establish continuity of reading skills instruction for this child puts in historic perspective the development of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS), and the codification of the National Migrant Education Program reading skills.

Sources of Data

The sources of information studied included government publications, state departments of education reports, books, journals, and ERIC reports. Personal communications were made by telephone with key personnel in migrant education. The writer used the services of the University of Mississippi Main Library, the Reference Department, Documents Depository, and Microforms Collection. Additional materials were obtained from the School of Education Curriculum Laboratory, the Reading Services Center, and the Bureau of Educational Research.

Limitations

Language Arts in the broadest sense traditionally includes listening, speaking, reading, and writing activities. It was not within the scope of this presentation to deal adequately with all aspects of language skills although the integration of each to the other makes separation difficult. The focus of this study was on the reading skills aspect as one area in the provision of compensatory education for the migrant disadvantaged student.

Reference was made to bilingual materials because the language barrier is often an obstacle migrant children have to overcome in learning to read. These materials were not considered apart from their relationship to the acquisition of reading skills.

Programs for the migrant population are national in scope. However, this study was limited to the Eastern Stream Region because Mississippi is one of the 21 states within the geographic bounds of the Atlantic Coast migratory pattern of movement. Interstate cooperation was a feasible means of showing how continuity of reading skills instruction was developed between a "home base" state in the Florida plan, and a "host" state in the New York program. The study encompassed a time frame of 14 years from 1965 to 1979.

Methodology

The writer used the method of historical or documentary research. The chapters were organized according to the chronological developments within the subject area. Chapter One, The Problem and Its Background, includes the purpose, the problem and significance of the study, sources of data, limitations, and methodology used.

Chapter Two, Description of the Population, describes who the migrants were by ethnic structure. It discusses the migrants in the Eastern Stream over the 14 year period studied.

Chapter Three, National Legislation and MSRTS, gives the background and provisions contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 and its subsequent amendments. The development of the MSRTS includes early attempts of record keeping and exchange. It explains how the system works.

In Chapter Four the emphasis is on assessment, tutorial outreach, and reading skills. The chapter opens with a discussion of what constitutes reading. The section on assessment is concerned with the stating of educational objectives and goals, and how they are to be measured and evaluated. The tutorial outreach portion of the chapter presents the rationale, program content, and evaluation procedures for the Florida Language Arts Tutorial Program, and the New York

Tutorial Outreach Program. The chapter concludes with an examination of the rationale and content of the National Migrant Education Program Reading Skills.

The study concludes with Chapter Five, Summary, Projection, and Recommendations. The writer attempts in this chapter to put in historic perspective the efforts to provide educational continuity for the individual migrant child. The writer projects that the use of the MSRTS as a data collection system to serve the migrant population could be extended to other mobile populations, and suggests that innovations in program management developed in the TOPS migrant program could be applied to other populations as well.

Chapter 2

DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

The term "migrant" is defined in the Random House Dictionary (1967, p. 908) as one who migrates, as a migratory worker, but that does not tell the whole story. There is no single delineation of migrant that fits each individual who is categorized as a part of this population.

Ethnic Structure

Migratory workers are a mixture of races, colors, and creeds as are Americans in general. The difference between migrants and the general population is that the former must migrate to eke out an existence, whereas the latter move freely if they choose to do so. As noted by Fuller (1953), the President's Commission on Migratory Labor reported that "thousands of Negro families" (p. 3) worked the Florida vegetable harvests in the winter. In the summer these workers traveled north through the Carolinas, Virginia, New Jersey, and New York. Sometimes they went into New England to find work.

Fuller went on to describe the seasonal movement from one area to another as proceeding along "fairly well defined routes" (p. 7) such as the one up the East Coast. However,

he pointed out that individual families did not always move along the same route. Many families did not know where they were going or if they would find work when they arrived (Fuller, 1953).

Other ethnic groups, consisting "of Puerto Ricans and some Anglos" (Edwards, 1960, p. 14) joined the Negroes in the Eastern Stream movement. In the central part of the country, "Texas-Mexicans pushed out by the 'wetbacks' from across the Rio Grande" (p. 14) worked Texas in the winter then moved north for the cotton harvest. According to Edwards the central stream workers migrated to Colorado for sugar beets and on into Illinois, Michigan, and Minnesota for other crops.

A third migratory pattern was described by Shotwell (1961) as one which centered on California as the home base state. This western stream was largely composed of Latin-Americans or other Spanish-speaking families, Indians, "Anglos without families" (p. 30), and others who moved into Oregon and Washington. Shotwell depicted the general migratory patterns then stated, "Yet to make precise predictions about the composition of migrant farm-labor streams in a given year is no safer than to generalize about the location of colors in a kaleidoscope" (p. 31).

The Eastern Stream

What could be predicted in the migrant trek across the farms and fields from Florida to New York was that the life

would be one of deprivation, poverty, injustice, and despair. Wright (1965), a reporter for the New York World-Telegram and Sun, worked with the migrant families as they harvested the crops. He told of large families who lived in cramped squalor with inadequate diets and poor medical care. His account exposed how the migrant workers were exploited by crew leaders and growers. He explained that their legal rights were either non-existent or unenforced. He added that the migrants were unable to find other jobs because they had neither the education nor the training required. The original Wright series was reprinted in the Congressional Record and helped focus national attention on the migrants' problems.

One of the problems was estimating the number of individuals trapped in the migratory stream, thus identifying them in order to provide relief. The one million migratory workers cited by Greene (1954) did not include the young children and older persons who traveled with the migrants although they did no work in the fields (p. 2).

In the decade that followed, the estimated number of migratory workers in the United States had doubled to two million (Moore, 1965, p. 14). In the Eastern Stream the number was estimated to be 50,000 persons (Nelson, 1966). By the early seventies Friedland and Nelkin (1971, p. 3) reported that the most recent census count had placed the number of migrant workers in the United States between

400,000 and 2,000,000. As Friedland and Nelkin explained it, there was a large disparity between the figures because it was hard to get an accurate count of people who moved constantly.

Representatives of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1968) reminded the coordinators of state migrant programs that the number of migratory workers was based on statistics gathered by the Department of Labor. Those statistics, according to government personnel, represented workers and not children. The chief of the Migrant Program Branch of the United States Office of Education (USOE) estimated that there were over 700,000 children of agricultural migrant parents in the country (Rivera, 1969). Rivera expressed the opinion that the Department of Labor's estimate of 1.5 children for each couple was too low. According to his point of view, many migrant families had as many as ten children, although he admitted there was no "real base for figures on the migrant child" (p. 7).

By 1970 a data base had been established through the statistics of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. Ten years after the Rivera estimate was made, the director of the MSRTS was able to verify that an actual count of 722,000 migrant children had been identified in the nation (Miller, Note 1). Miller did not indicate how many of these children identified moved within the boundaries of the Eastern Stream.

However, Miller (1969) had pinpointed mobility as one of the problems that shaped the characteristics and needs of migrant children.

Characteristics of Migrant Children

Edwards (1960) portrayed the experiences of migrant children as being vastly different from other American children. She observed that while they traveled a good deal, they rarely saw much more than the migrant camps along the way. They could carry few belongings with them because the family truck was crowded with people. Edwards reported that she saw no way migrant children could live like other Americans unless the schools responded to their needs.

Morales (1965) found that migrant families suffered from isolation, poverty and illiteracy. He cited a Department of Agriculture survey which showed that only 14 percent of the Eastern Stream migrants had finished the second grade. A third of these migrants left school before the fifth grade and another third never entered the seventh grade. In his account of their problems, Morales stated that the migrant children were not achieving at the expected grade levels. This failure to achieve was due to spasmodic school attendance rather than lack of capability.

In a psychological study of migrants in the Eastern Stream Coles (1970) checked on school attendance among the children of the ten families he was observing and found each

child averaged about "a week and a half of school . . . during the month" (p. 39). Coles described the migrant children as,

> . . . both active and fearful, full of initiative and desperately forlorn, driven to a wide range of ingenious and resourceful deeds and terribly paralyzed by all sorts of things: the weakness and lethargy that go with hunger and malnutrition, and the sadness and hopelessness that I suppose can be called part of their "preschool education." (pp. 33-34)

A government study (USOE, 1970) directed attention to some of the positive characteristics migrant families managed to exhibit despite the poverty and deprivation in their lives. According to the Office of Education report the migrants worked hard for slim wages, developed a sense of responsibility at a young age, and contributed to the American economy.

The purpose of a six-state cooperative project (California State Department of Education, 1971) was to determine the characteristics of farm migrant children in order to improve their educational opportunities. Many of the findings were similar to those already documented (Coles, 1970; Edwards, 1960; Morales, 1965) in this chapter and were not repeated. The project committee characterized the migrant child, however, in the following manner:

> He is able to achieve satisfactorily when his special needs are met. He is shy and may feel unaccepted. He is subject to a marked increase in fears as he starts to school. He is subject to more classroom tensions and pressures than the average student. He generally comes from a patriarchal culture. His

native language is frequently Spanish. He is frequently learning English as a second language. (p. 11)

Educational Needs of Migrant Children

The recommendations of the Migrant Research Project Board based on field studies in Florida and Virginia by Greene (1954) included the need to provide kindergartens and nursery schools, to study how to place migrant students at the proper grade level, and to hire enough trained teachers (p. 12). A key recommendation of the board was that migrant children must be encouraged to attend school beginning at an early age if their educational needs were to be met (p. 13).

The educational needs of migrant children were discussed in the report (California State Department of Education, 1971) which suggested that a wide range of experiences should be offered these mobile students. The experiential programs should begin in preschool, improve the child's self-concept, expand his/her language facility, encourage growth in independence, and promote social acceptance. The report proposed that academic achievement should start at a level appropriate for each child and be followed through using a program of individualized instruction. The six-state cooperative project report added that, "The education of migrant pupils is made up of fragments. . . . Solving the problems caused by mobility is complex and difficult" (p. 26).

The problems caused by mobility were examined in a study by Bollenbacher (1962) of sixth grade students in Cincinnati over a five and a half year period. Approximately 8 percent of the entire grade were found to have moved back and forth to southern states during that time. Bollenbacher observed that providing continuity of education for transient students was not easy to achieve. According to the findings of the Cincinnati study, results of standardized tests in reading and group intelligence showed that lack of reading achievement was not influenced by student mobility but rather was due to lack of ability.

Another study (Snipes, 1966) investigated the relationship between mobility, reading vocabulary, and reading comprehension of sixth grade students in Georgia. This study was conducted in six schools located in one central Georgia county which had "experienced a phenomenal growth of 86.8 percent" (p. 243) in the decade prior to the study. Of the 483 students involved only 139 had not changed schools in five years. The remaining 344 moved in from within the county, another county in Georgia, another state or another country. The investigator found that mobility seemed to exert a positive influence on reading achievement in both vocabulary and comprehension. Snipes suggested that the problems caused by pupil mobility were more likely to be ones of adjustment rather than academic achievement.

Sutton (1960) chose to use the mobility of the migrant children in her classroom by emphasizing their travel and work experiences in a positive way. She prepared a series of diagnostic exercises about picking beans, potatoes, and counting the produce to place them according to their reading levels (p. 54). Sutton wrote, "Even though a child received individual help . . . he was a regular participating member of the class and not isolated or different because of his need" (p. 73).

Another point of view was expressed by Tancredi (1969) who noted that the migrant child had very limited experience to prepare him/her for school despite continual traveling. In his opinion, by isolating the itinerant students from better-prepared classmates, they would not have to adjust to some grade level for which they were not ready. Tancredi advocated,

> As with any really successful program in education, an attempt should be made to individualize as much as possible. It has been generally agreed that the structured program in reading . . . operates to the best advantage for migrant children, but the standard curricula are almost always inadequate. (p. 96)

Regardless of the method selected to teach reading, it was apparent to many (Crenshaw, 1967; Miller, 1969; Sutton, 1966) that a system to increase continuity in school experiences through the use of standardized transferral records was a top priority. Legislation passed by Congress stipulated that the states coordinate programs and projects to

transmit school records. This was accomplished in the development of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

Chapter 3

NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND MSRTS

America, in the early 1960s, was peering inward at its own needs as a nation. Two world wars and conflict in Korea had subsided when President Lyndon Johnson launched a war on poverty. Education was the ammunition and the target was disadvantaged children in low income areas.

The Congress of the United States enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) on April 11, 1965 "to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools" (U.S. Statutes at Large, 1966, p. 27). This legislation passed by the first session of the 89th Congress is known as Public Law 89-10.

In a description and analysis of the ESEA (The First Work, 1965) it was reported that passage of Public Law 89-10 made "apparent that there is a close relationship between poverty and the lack of educational development and poor academic performance" (p. 14).

The original legislation did not leave to chance the decision of who would be eligible for the financial assistance. The local education agency (LEA) was,

> . . . required to have at least 100 children or 3 percent of its total enrollment from low-income families. The poverty indicators were: children aged 5 through 17 in families with an annual income below $2,000, according to the 1960 census; and children in the same age group from families with an annual income above $2,000 who receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) under title IV of the Social Security Act. (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1972, p. 3)

The poverty indicator alone would appear to be enough to qualify migrant children for services under Title I, ESEA. According to Moore (1965) migrant families in the Eastern Stream frequently reported annual incomes of only $500 or $600 (p. 139). Wright (1965) found that most migrant workers indicated that their yearly earnings from farm work were between $900 and $1200 (p. 123).

Amendments of the 1960s

Migrant children were qualified to receive the many benefits under Title I, ESEA but their mobility often prohibited their staying in a target area long enough to be helped. Recognizing this fact, a year and a half after Public Law 89-10 had been signed, the second session of the 89th Congress amended it through Public Law 89-750 (U.S. Statutes at Large, 1967) to grant, "payments to state educational agencies for assistance in educating migratory children of migratory agricultural workers" (p. 1192).

In a description of the major amendments to the Act (What's New in ESEA, 1967) it was noted that the target area

had been changed to a target-population. The article explained that deserving children had been placed in categories and the distribution formula had been changed to accommodate their needs.

The distribution of funds to meet the special needs of migratory children was assigned to the state education agency (SEA) to administer (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1970). This distribution was made on the basis of a formula under which a state received a maximum grant,

> . . . computed by the sum of the estimated number of migrant children aged 5 to 17 residing, full or part time, in the State, multiplied by the national or State average per pupil expenditure, whichever is higher (p. 6).

After the grant was computed there remained the work of planning programs and projects. One report (What's New in ESEA, 1967) revealed that arranging for the education of migratory children was a major task because they stayed such a short time in any one location that the schools never knew how many students to expect or how long they would stay. The article reported, "Well over half of these children are not achieving at their grade level, and a substantial number of them are two years or more behind in their schooling" (p. 18).

On the advice of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1970) the programs designed were to meet the identified needs in the areas of health, food services, psychological counseling, career planning, and social development. The federal agency recommended that remedial

instruction be focused on the language arts skills of reading, speaking, listening, and writing using bilingual materials.

Because the need to ensure continuity of services was so crucial for migrant children, Congress amended the original Act again in 1968, Public Law 90-247 (U.S. Statutes at Large, 1969) mandated,

> For purposes of this subsection, with the concurrence of his parents, a migratory child of a migratory agricultural worker shall be deemed to continue to be such a child for a period, not in excess of five years, during which he resides in the area served by the agency carrying on a program or project under this subsection. (p. 787)

One of the difficulties in planning programs and projects was that the appropriations for one fiscal year had to be spent during the same year. As a result, it was often spent unwisely. In an assessment of Public Law 91-230, the education amendments of 1969, Frohlicher (1970) found that the legislation was revised to allow administrators to carry over funds allocated in one fiscal year for programs continued in the following year.

The amount of funds appropriated for the migrant program when the first grants were made in 1967 totaled $9,700,000 (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1970), and the number of children who participated the first year was estimated to be 80,000 (Grants to States, 1971). The most recent figures available from MSRTS put the amount appropriated at $209,000,000 and verified that the number of children served totaled 722,000 (Miller, Note 1).

The funds could be used in a variety of ways to provide services contingent upon determined needs (Grants to States, 1971). As stated in the article instruction could take place in local schoolrooms, in other centers, and in mobile classrooms transported to migrant camps. Some states conducted spring and summer remedial classes for transient students during the harvest period. Other educational agencies instituted projects which modified the full year curriculum to meet the needs of part time pupils.

Amendments of the 1970s

As the tumultuous 1960s passed into history, the American people turned from domestic concerns to the continuing battles in Vietnam. The tightening up of the money supply for education was reflected in the amendments of 1972. Public Law 92-318 (U.S. Statutes at Large, 1973) permitted,

> Such children who are presently migrant, as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, shall be given priority in the consideration of programs and activities contained in applications submitted under this subsection. (p. 352)

Public Law 92-318 established the National Institute of Education (NIE), and it mandated a study of the operations of Title I for migratory children. The study was to evaluate the specific programs and projects in terms of impact, and was to review the administration of the programs and projects by the SEA (Alford, 1972).

The evaluation (Exotech Systems, Inc., 1974) found that due to the fact that most migrant students had left school by the ninth grade the greatest number of children enrolled were in the lower grades. The results of the study showed that those children who remained in school in the primary grades failed to keep pace with their grade level peers in academic areas. By the third or fourth grade the average migratory child required almost three years "to advance one grade level" (p. 32).

On the national scene President Nixon had managed to pull American troops out of Vietnam. Americans were subsequently stunned by the Watergate scandal and Nixon's resignation as Chief Executive. Corruption and misbehavior in high places reinforced Congressional desire for assessment and evaluation. This intent was reflected in the passage of Public Law 93-380 (U.S. Statutes at Large, 1975) which called for "independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects" (p. 499).

This law directed the Commissioner of Education to establish standards for migrant programs and to encourage the development of model projects (Alford, 1975). The Commissioner was asked to devise a system to locate outstanding programs and to publicize their effectiveness. Alford reported that funds were allocated on a first priority basis to programs serving categorical groups which included children of migratory fishermen for the first time. And for

the first time also the migrant student record transfer system was "authorized for fund allocation purposes" (p. 7).

The education amendments of 1978, known as Public Law 95-561, were much more specific in how the programs would be administered at all levels (Alford, 1979). Alford attributed the greater detail in the law to growing distrust between the legislative and executive branches of government and to the education lobbyists who had discovered it was "easier to get their views expressed in law rather than in regulations" (p. 7).

The review of the 1978 amendments by Alford (1979) expressed the opinion that parent advisory councils would be given an opportunity to help plan programs and to see that they were implemented. The National Institute of Education was directed to monitor techniques used to train the membership and to determine the effectiveness of the advisory councils.

Alford (1979) reported that migrant programs would be continued because Congress had stated that programs for categorical populations would receive top priority once again. In his summary of the action taken by the 95th Congress, Alford explained that the legislators refused to set an amount to be spent on basic skills because funds were needed for other supportive services as well. Alford concluded, "the legislation reflects an overall emphasis on basic skills, but not an exclusive focus" (p. 8).

Early Attempts at Record Exchange

Nearly twenty years before the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act it was apparent to the Federal Interagency Committee on Migrant Labor that migrant children needed some means of maintaining and exchanging their school reports (Pfeil, 1970). The committee suggested that statewide systems be set up for school records to be sent wherever the migrant child might go.

The passage of Public Law 89-75[illegible] (U.S. Statutes at Large, 1967) mandated the States, "to coordinate these programs and projects with . . . other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records" (p. 1192). The Committee on Migrant Labor had recommended interstate cooperation which Congress had fulfilled by making it a legal requirement.

In response to the requirement Florida developed a transfer record for migrant children (Crenshaw, 1967). The report was color-coded, distributed and field tested in the Eastern Stream States of Delaware, New York, Georgia and the Carolinas initially. Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were added in 1968. The Crenshaw account stated that Florida maintained a Central File in the State Department of Education to administer, collect, dispense and analyze the school records.

Other states devised their own methods of record keeping which often relied upon the child to carry report cards to the next school, but most cards never reached their destination (Pfeil, 1970). Some effort was expended on surveys to gather information about how many migrant students traveled within a state and between states and where they were likely to go as an aid to program planning (California State Department of Education, 1971).

In February, 1968 a committee of eight states gathered in Phoenix, Arizona to begin the task of coordinating all the state efforts to develop a record transfer system which would satisfy the needs of the mobile school population (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1968). The interstate committee originated a system that would be performed manually at first but capable of being transformed into a data-processing system at a later time.

Development of MSRTS

The state migrant coordinators met twice in 1968, once in Denver, Colorado to review the first records, and again in Atlantic City, New Jersey to accept the first uniform transfer form (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1976). Hypermetrics of California designed the approved data bank system (Puentes, 1969) which began as a manual operation and then was converted into a fully automated system.

Puentes reported that Arkansas was selected as the site of the proposed data bank depository because of its geographic location.

The funding for the migrant student record transfer system was a cooperative venture among the states, Pfeil (1970) told how it came about.

> Each participating State contributed a certain portion of its 1969 Title I migrant projects appropriation. The resulting $426,000 financed a developmental contract with the Arkansas State Department of Education. The State department then subcontracted with the University of Arkansas Medical Center, which has one of the largest computer systems in Arkansas, to develop the programming for the system. (p. 7).

The central depository in Little Rock was designed to provide a base where all the information would be housed (Puentes, 1969). Puentes added that terminals were to be operated on a flexible basis from either the county seat or the schools with a direct link to the data bank.

To carry out the legal obligation for interstate coordination the various states met frequently to decide what information would go on the child's record (Pfeil, 1970). The reporting form was adapted and improved for more than two years before it was finally approved. Eventually, the record form contained "basic background information on the child, academic data from the last four schools he attended, and coded information on health examinations" (p. 7).

By September, 1970 seven pilot states were linked to the system (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1976).

The states were brought into the system in groups of about seven beginning with the Western States in February, 1971. The Eastern States joined the data bank in May of the same year and by July, 1971 the Northern States had completed the national hook-up.

The MSRTS grew so rapidly that by the summer of 1973 it had outgrown the facilities leased from the Medical Center (Hogan, 1973). The Arkansas Department of Education installed its own computer, "thereby gaining top priority for the migrant record system and providing opportunities for other agencies to develop analogous systems" (p. 22).

The effectiveness of the system was recognized by the Congress of the United States in the passage of Public Law 93-380 in 1974. This legislation authorized the use of MSRTS statistics to produce the official tally of migrant children for allocation of funds (Park, 1976).

By 1977 it was decided that a larger computer was essential to keep pace with the demands for faster services to the nation's schools (Dyer, 1977). A new computer was bought for the Little Rock center from a federal agency which no longer used the size computer MSRTS needed.

In 1978 section 143 of Public Law 95-561 was written to assure continual funding for the operation and expansion of MSRTS and interstate coordination (Miller, Note 1). The provision, according to information supplied by Miller,

stipulated that at least $6,000,000 or no more than 5 percent of the total migrant allocation was to be set aside for those two activities.

How the System Worked

In 1969 Puentes explained that the data bank system had three objectives, "to provide relevant information on each student, to use a national standard and to preserve continuity of information" (p. 18). He reported that the information had to be coded into numerical data before the computer processed it. When the information was received the data recording personnel examined and prepared the data for retrieval when the student record needed to be revised.

The information on the student record (Pfeil, 1970) was telephoned to a terminal operator by the school clerk using the proper identification. The terminal was "connected to the central data bank at Little Rock via a leased line . . . from the telephone company" (p. 8). If the student had been enrolled previously, Pfeil observed, and had been given an identification number then the computer processed the new enrollment request promptly. However, if the student failed to bring a record which contained a coded identification number the clerk asked for critical data to be supplied. Critical data included the student's name, sex, birthdate and birthplace. The computer then gave the student's ID number, the requested academic information, and the important health

data. Information that was not needed at once, Pfeil continued, was filed whenever there was time. Such information included the requests for complete transcripts, revised information, and withdrawal notification.

As efficient as the migrant student record transfer system was programmed to be, it was not free of criticism (Hogan, 1973). Some schools failed to send revised information to the computer soon enough to be processed before migrant students had moved away so the data was often inaccurate. If the functioning of the MSRTS was criticized so was the reporting form. Hogan added, "Those filling it out are confined to checking the rows of prescribed boxes, they say, with no provision for observations and comments" (p. 23). Further criticism centered on protecting the privacy of individual student records maintained by the data bank. According to the Hogan account, "One notable decision, reflecting the concern over possible invasion of privacy, is that the record will not include comments from teachers" (p. 24). Hogan concluded that though the transfer system was imperfect it was functioning as intended to provide continuity for the child who migrated so frequently from school to school.

Early in 1978, Dyer, the Assistant Director of User Services for MSRTS, gave an account of the various national committees who had been assigned to improve the reporting of the academic data. Dyer announced that the committees had

suggested many changes to aid the participating schools and that the reading committee had compiled a list of reading skills.

Chapter 4

ASSESSMENT, TUTORIAL OUTREACH, AND READING SKILLS

The purpose of this study was to trace the development of selected approaches to provide continuity in reading progress for individual children who had unique needs as migrants. The focus was on reading skills as one area in the provision of compensatory education for the migrant disadvantaged student. A key factor was the word "approach" which indicated a method applied to the definition of a problem and an attempt at its solution. The writer's decision to concentrate on reading skills was taken from the report of the National Migrant Education Reading Skills Committee which asked, "What constitutes reading? What is the essence of any reading program, and how would one display that essence?" (Bove, 1979, p. 7).

What does constitute reading? Smith (1963) presented a historical survey of American reading instruction which portrayed many interpretations of that question. She conveyed the information that the term "language arts," for example, came into being in the 1930s as a practical way to integrate listening, speaking, reading, and writing under one heading (pp. 59-60). Smith did not explicitly state what constitutes reading, but it was interesting to note that she devoted

one-third of the textbook to basic skills in reading. Language arts was the broad area designated for this study. Despite the danger of fragmentation in choosing only one strand of the family, it was necessary to give reading the proper attention. In addition, the Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Program (FMCCP) which was one of those examined in this chapter used the name Language Arts Tutorial (LAT) to describe its reading efforts.

Inherent in the question of what constitutes reading was the controversy discussed by Clymer (1972) that had been argued in reading circles for years. "Does reading involve only the translation of printed symbols to the spoken word, or does reading involve understanding of those words as well?"(p. 2). Other perspectives on the problem in the same reference were given by such reading specialists as Harris, Russell, and Singer.

Perhaps the best response to the controversy was expressed by Smith (1978). He declared that,

> Such a question does not ask anything about the reading act, only about the way in which the word is used. And the only possible answer is that sometimes "reading" certainly implies comprehension . . . and sometimes it does not. (p. 8)

Smith chose to consider the terms "reading" and "comprehension of print" as synonymous.

The second question consisted of determining what made up the essence of any reading program. Among members of the reading skills committee for the migrant program there came

eventual agreement that skills constituted the substance of any reading program. Reading skills have been labeled differently by textbook writers (Karlin, 1975; Miller, 1972; Smith, 1963) but usually included skills in word recognition/identification, vocabulary/language development, word meaning/comprehension, and study skills/reading in content area. No intended sequence should be inferred from the way the skills were listed. In this study specific reading skills were recorded as they were expressed in the programs reviewed.

The third question involved how one would display the essence of any reading program. A clue was extracted from the word "display." Display implied an exhibit of some objective that could be measured. Measurement of educational objectives was enhanced by the development of a taxonomy "intended to provide for classification of the goals of our educational system" (Bloom, 1956, p. 1).

Assessment

The inspiration for the assessment of goals in education came from the sciences which structure groups according to classes. The proponents of the taxonomy believed that people behave in a way that can be studied and recorded. The way that individuals are expected to act can be expressed as performance objectives. As Bloom (1956) acknowledged, "Such

behavior can be observed and described, and these descriptive statements can be classified" (p. 5).

The taxonomists organized behavior in six main classes beginning with simple ideas and progressing to more difficult ones. The classes in ascending levels are labeled as knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The cognitive domain of the taxonomy includes those educational objectives which are concerned with remembering information and transferring what has been recalled to new situations. Bloom (1956) specified that what he meant by educational objectives was the "explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process" (p. 26).

In evaluating the educative process for migrant children, Wey and Cheyney (1972) advocated national goals that would maintain a constant evaluation of specific objectives. They proposed that any new program for migrant children should include the major objectives of that program and incorporate an evaluation design as well.

In 1972, Badaracca conducted a needs assessment study to establish behavioral objectives for the educational needs of migrant children. The needs were classified by Badaracca into specific areas. The study concluded that there was a need in reading to:

1. Develop a sight vocabulary.
2. Develop word attack skills.

3. Develop concepts of vocabulary usage.

4. Develop the decoding process for printed symbols.

5. Develop ability to utilize complex word analysis and structural analysis skills.

6. Develop ability to use context clues.

7. Develop meaning from printed symbols.

8. Develop independent research skills.

9. Develop study skills (p. 5).

Many of the same needs in the area of reading which were outlined by Badaracca were expressed by Curtis and Caputo (1971) in behavioral language. For example, in the development of a sight vocabulary the specific educational objective would be to recognize basic sight words. It could be stated, "the pupil shall demonstrate his ability to recognize and name pictures depicting 100 basic nouns" (p. 30).

The Office of Education (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1973) published instructions to be used to write performance objectives in terms of desired behavior. Behavior was to be spelled out in action words or verbs that stated a set of conditions to be met. The behavior was to be written with as little ambiguity as possible. The person affected was to be described, and the level of performance expected was to be indicated in measurement terms.

In reviewing the literature on the use of behavioral objectives in education, Lapp (1972) concluded that writing the statement of the desired behavior to be accomplished was

only the first step in the evaluation of an instructional program. To determine if the expected level of performance had been met, it was necessary to consider measurement instruments.

Measurement instruments generally were classified in two broad categories referred to as standardized or norm-referenced tests, and diagnostic or criterion-referenced tests. According to Mehrens and Lehmann (1969, p. 6), standardized tests used a set procedure to derive information from a ranking or norm which told how the person being tested stood in relation to the others who took the same test. The results of his/her raw score could be converted into a percentile rank by referring to a table of norms. The score might be expressed also as a grade-level equivalency. An example of this shown as 4.3 would indicate a performance level comparable to the third month of the fourth grade.

One of the problems with the use of norm-referenced tests was that they did not tell how much the test-taker knew (Smith, Smith & Brink, 1977, p. 1). They wrote, "Criterion-referenced tests (CRT) are designed to measure a specified set of skills called criterion behaviors" (p. 2). In assessing the number of acquired skills, the test-taker could know a percentage of them, perhaps 10 percent, 50 percent, or 80 percent. Criterion-referenced tests could be constructed to show the results in a ratio score as "the total number of skills learned divided by the total number of skills

required" (p. 2). Smith, Smith and Brink reported that criterion-referenced tests could be recognized by the three scores they yielded, percentile ranks, grade-level equivalencies, and ratio scores.

Criterion-referenced tests were seen by Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus (1971, pp. 91-92) as useful in diagnostic evaluation for two purposes, (a) to place the student for initial instruction, and (b) to discover the weaknesses that were impeding progress. Reading diagnosis, remediation, and evaluation were studied (Conklin, 1970; Ekwall, 1977; Farr, 1969; & Strang, 1968) for different school populations, among them the disadvantaged. While there was no concensus as to the best means of diagnosing reading problems, there were several options, presented in the texts above, available for prescribing remediation.

Some remediation was designed to be carried out in the classroom, some through special reading groups not in the classroom, and some through reading clinics or tutorial situations. There was a growing awareness because of the needs assessments of the importance of diagnosing individual differences in the learning situation and prescribing remediation tailored to that particular child's needs. The tutorial approach was one effective method of meeting individual needs.

Tutorial Outreach

The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 and subsequent amendments gave impetus to providing assistance for those children whose achievement in school fell far short of the national norm. Funds were made available for tutoring programs as one way to bridge the gap between the disadvantaged and the advantaged child. The use of supplemental personnel allowed the teaching staff to expand to meet individual needs.

Ruddell (1974) described tutors as they related to the reading-language arts program. He defined a tutor as "An adult or student (any age) working with an individual student on a paid or volunteer basis" (p. 581). He distinguished an instructional tutor as one who tutored in various reading and language skills according to a regularly scheduled plan. The support tutor, on the other hand, assisted when called upon to fulfill a temporary need.

For the purpose of this study, a tutor was defined according to the description offered in the program design of Florida's Language Arts Tutorial (LAT) plan and New York's Tutorial Outreach Program (TOP). In general, however, tutors in both programs would fit Ruddell's instructional criteria.

Florida is considered to be the sending or home base state for many of the migrants in the Eastern Stream. New York is one of the receiving or host states. They were

selected for this study to demonstrate how interstate cooperation was an effective vehicle in the development of continuity of reading skills instruction for the individual migrant child. Both Florida and New York made some attempts to take care of the needs of their migrant populations before the advent of the ESEA, but those efforts were not within the time frame chosen for this study.

In the 14 year span from 1965 to 1979, both Florida and New York experienced changes in the ethnic composition of the migrant population which necessitated new approaches to educational instruction. One study, shortly after the passage of the migrant education amendment (Kleinert, 1969) described three distinct subcultures in Florida. The first group of white single men traveled without children and were not included in this study. The second group of American blacks came from the "rural sharecropper tradition" (p. 92) of neighboring Southern states, and they usually traveled with several children as family groups. The third subculture consisted of closely united Texas-Mexican families Kleinert observed. The Spanish language and traditions of these Mexican-Americans would lead to the development of bilingual materials for the migrant population in the years to come.

In the mid-1960s, however, the largest migrant subculture in Florida was the second group of American blacks. It was for this group that Florida first developed its migrant educational program in language arts (Biller & Meredith, 1970).

The Communication Skills Program (Markham Elementary School, 1967) was designed to assist with instruction in reading, listening, speaking, and writing. The Markham skills program employed a diagnostic approach to learning which stressed individual achievement in language skills through a structured sequence. Each participating child was appraised, placed at the appropriate level in the communication program, and moved through the progression to achieve his/her fullest potential.

The importance of the Markham project for this study was that it was an early cooperative venture between local, state, and federal agencies to provide compensatory education for the children in the Pompano Migrant Labor Camp in Broward County, Florida (Biller & Meredith, 1970). It was a model for the development of the language arts component of the Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Program (FMCCP) in its emphasis on an individualized approach and the provision of tutorial services.

The evaluation of the Markham project (Biller & Meredith, 1970) revealed that the effectiveness of the program was largely negated by the reassignment of the original faculty to other schools after the 1969-70 school year in order to implement desegregation. Biller and Meredith reported that the teachers who had been selected and trained to understand the special needs of migrant children were reassigned first. Then the original children were scattered among several schools. The result, concluded Biller and Meredith, was that

no valid comparison could be made between the experimental and the control schools, and the project as originally conceived no longer existed.

The Florida Plan (Crenshaw, 1967) established a statewide comprehensive educational program for agricultural migrant children in accordance with USOE guidelines. One important feature of the Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Program plan called for a language development program in communication skills. Another important feature provided for interstate visits from Florida to other states in the Eastern Stream where migrants were working in the summer. The trips to New York by Florida teachers and the mutual exchange of ideas and materials demonstrated that interstate cooperation could lead to successful program development.

Interstate cooperation was advanced by the establishment of annual Eastern Stream Regional Migrant Education Workshops in 1970. Of particular importance for this study was the sixth annual meeting in Orlando, Florida in 1975. It was here that an interstate state plan for migrant children was formulated. The report (After Ten Years, 1976) presented the rationale and principal objectives for language arts which the LAT and TOP approaches utilized. The rationale for the language arts program was based on the mobility and culturally different backgrounds migrant children experienced. There were two principal objectives.

1. To provide a language arts program stressing listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

2. To provide for the instruction of the child in reading English, using the child's dominant language as appropriate (p. 6).

The interstate state plan (After Ten Years, 1976) called for teaching reading readiness, concept formation, placement through school records, diagnosis through use of teacher-made or criterion-referenced tests, individualized instruction, and activities which link language to vocational needs. Classroom instruction was to be supplemented by tutorial and small group experiences in language arts (pp. 6-7).

The Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Program regional plan was cited as one of several exemplary programs (Mattera & Steel, 1974) chosen because of its extensive services and application to other migrant education programs. The Florida language arts tutorial component was selected for this study because it represented an approach used in a home base state. New York was chosen because it represented a host state that attempted to improve continuity of instruction through interstate cooperation.

The distinction between a sending and a receiving state was an important one for this study. The LAT and TOP efforts were compared and contrasted to demonstrate how each state adapted its programs to meet the special needs of its mobile population.

The programs were described here as they operated in 1975 for several reasons. The reasons were, (a) the interstate state plan for language arts had been adopted early in the year, (b) the Florida schools had adjusted to integration, (c) the emergence of an increasingly bilingual migrant population had become apparent, (d) the TOP plan had been in operation long enough to be evaluated, and (e) the basic design of the programs had been implemented.

The students to be served were defined in the regulations for ESEA Title I Migrant Education Programs (Mohan, 1975), as,

> 1. Interstate Migrant. A child who has moved with a parent or guardian within the past year across State boundaries in order that a parent, guardian or member of his immediate family might secure temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture or in related food processing activities.
>
> 2. Intrastate Migrant. A child who has moved with a parent or guardian within the past year across school district boundaries within a state in order that a parent, guardian or member of his immediate family might secure temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture or in related food processing activities. (pp. 13-14)

The Florida State Department of Education (FSDE) estimated the language arts tutorial component would serve 8,111 students during the fiscal year 1975. The actual count was 11,306 (FSDE, 1975, p. 19). The numbers served in New York appeared to be surprisingly small by comparison. The TOP had begun with a total of 307 migrant children within 13 schools from October, 1973 through June, 1974 (Thompson, 1974, p. 19). In 1975 the program served 390 children in grades

K-12 within 17 school districts (Mohan, 1975, p. 14). In comparing the numbers it must be remembered that Florida, the sending state, dispersed migrants to many states so while New York's share of participating children might appear to have been relatively small, it was probably proportional.

Once the students had been identified as eligible, according to the definitions of migrant children prescribed by law, they were recruited for the program according to their reading needs. In Florida, those students who were identified as remedial readers and those with oral language deficiencies were given preference beginning in first grade. They were placed in the LAT on the basis of, (a) an informal reading assessment, (b) criterion scores from previous records, or (c) teacher referral. These students were pre-tested using a standardized test. The Stanford Achievement Test was administered by most schools in the state. The Criterion Reading Assessment was also used in the lower levels and the High Intensity Learning System for Reading was used in the higher levels (FSDE, 1975).

The New York Tutorial Outreach Program was established to meet the reading needs of a few children who were enrolled in several school districts where a single program would not be possible (Thompson, 1974). The New York Bureau of Migrant Education acknowledged that the program was based upon successful tutorial reading programs developed in Florida. According to Thompson, the New York model program was

established at the State University College at Fredonia. The college was the centralized facility at which tutors were trained before being assigned to students in the area school systems.

The tutorial program in Florida, which began in Broward County, sent tutors into those schools that had a high concentration of remedial reading students (Mattera & Steel, 1974) rather than a few scattered children as in New York. Florida established the criteria that the schools requesting tutors provide ample room to allow instructors to work with as many as three children at a time and that the schools assist the tutors willingly.

The tutors in the New York program were trained (Mohan, 1975) to determine the instructional and independent reading levels of individual migrant children through the use of the Spache Diagnostic Scale. The Random House Criterion Reading Program was used to prescribe the process by which diagnosed needs were to be met.

The goal of the language arts tutorial component of the FMCCP was to help students learn at their own rate and to achieve success in reading. The educational objectives were written as performance objectives to facilitate the use of proper measurement tools. The three performance objectives were,

1. Given the benefit of a minimum of 80 hours or more of instruction in the tutorial program, the migrant

student will demonstrate a mean gain of 1½ months for every 20 hours of instruction in overall reading achievement.

2. Given the benefit of a massive language saturation program, the student will demonstrate increased oral language skills.

3. Following small group and individual instruction in the migrant tutorial program, students will demonstrate ability to communicate and transfer learning in a variety of settings. (FSDE, 1975, p. 45)

The Florida program used three different instruments to evaluate the performance objectives. The Stanford Reading Test was administered to grades 2-12 to determine the gain in overall reading achievement. The Silvaroli Oral Language Assessment was administered as a pretest and a posttest to demonstrate increased oral language skills. The ability to communicate and transfer learning was evaluated through the records of student progress in the tutorial sessions. The tutor was to share this information with the classroom teacher.

The program design of the New York TOP plan formulated a general goal which was "to provide for each migrant child the educational treatment that will be most effective in developing the child's potential" (Mohan, 1975, p. 12). Of the eleven specific objectives listed, seven were related to the ability to function in standard English. One objective specified that an expected increase in self-confidence was to be seen. The remaining three objectives involved motivation and attitudes. The reading component was to offer remedial

reading instruction through the tutorial approach to migrant students who needed to achieve the TOP objectives.

According to the Mohan report, it was left to the tutor to help each migrant child with phonics, word structure, word meaning, word study skills, concept formation, following directions, dictionary skills, and individual reading needs. The effectiveness of the materials and program was to be evaluated for each individual child by the tutor also. The training sequence for the tutors in the New York program "was an adaptation of the training program presented by the team from Broward County, Florida" (Mohan, 1975, p. 19).

In the Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Program the staff consisted of, (a) regional program coordinators who set up the programs from three regional offices, (b) head teachers who supervised tutorial teachers and tutors for a particular county, (c) tutorial teachers who directed 10 tutors each, and taught 15 students themselves, and (d) tutors who were assigned to no more than 15 students (Mattera & Steel, 1974). The qualifications for the tutors were that they must have graduated from high school, have knowledge of the migrant lifestyle, and wish to help their students. Tutors were given thorough preservice training and continual inservice updating. Each tutor in the LAT worked with 15 children with whom he/she met each school day in groups of one to three. Each child received about 15 minutes of

individual attention in the 40-55 minute period. The rest of the time was spent with the entire group.

The staff of the New York program was similar to that of Florida's personnel. Mohan (1975) reported that TOP staff was composed of, (a) project directors who coordinated the total program, and acted as resource persons and consultants, (b) field coordinators who supervised tutors in scheduling, materials selection, and record keeping, and (c) tutors who worked directly with the children in an individual or small group setting. The qualifications for tutors were that they must have a high school diploma, "be enthusiastic, genuinely love kids, and convey a lack of prejudice toward migrant children" (Mohan, 1975, p. 15). The tutors were trained for approximately two weeks before being placed in surrounding schools. Inservice training was provided from time to time. Each tutor was assigned to one child, but sometimes worked with more than one child at a time. Each tutor was to come prepared to provide individual attention to one child while the other child or children worked independently with relevant materials. The length of each session consisted of 30-45 minutes.

The effectiveness of the Florida program was evaluated by the analysis of satisfactory program completion and the results of the standardized tests given (FSDE, 1975). The standardized test results were,

> . . . shown in grade level equivalents for ease in comparing gains to objectives. There were so few students who received 80 hours (4 months) of instruction, however, that this element of the objective was eliminated. (p. 45)

The Stanford Achievement Test was not used in all Florida counties so the gains could not be compared throughout the state. The average gain per month of instruction in the LAT as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test was 1.75 (FSDE, 1975, p. 46). This gain exceeded the stated objective of one and one-half months by a respectable margin.

The Oral Language Assessment was not given in Florida where there were no Spanish-speaking children. "Results, where it was used, revealed serious problems with validation" (FSDE, 1975, p. 46). Administrators recommended that the test be revised if it were to be used in the future.

The Criterion Reference Assessment system was the heart of the individualized tutorial reading program in Florida. The analysis of gains was made by diagnosing the skills not mastered before instruction and then equating them with the skills acquired after instruction. The percentages of gains ranged from 39 percent to 54 percent for the language arts tutorial program overall (FSDE, 1975, p. 48).

The effectiveness of the tutorial outreach program in New York was assessed in accordance with Provos' model of evaluation (Mohan, 1975). The program design and program installation had to be compatible or else one or the other had to be changed. Mohan reported that the information was

collected through field interviews with tutors,.teachers, and children. The evaluators found that,

> . . . the input elements consisting of student and staff performance measures, process variables such as student and staff activities, and output variables such as goals of the program did not differ from what was stated in the program design. (Mohan, 1975, p. 21)

Tutor and student interaction, in the New York reading program (Mohan, 1975), was systematically observed through a checklist that was compiled to place categories in behavior terms. The evaluation staff assessed whether the tutor had administered required tests, used lesson plans, completed student evaluation, developed instructional materials, and many more related endeavors. Mohan observed that the overall results were positive. The evaluation team discovered that the major point where procedure broke down was in sharing information between tutor and teacher.

The results of the tutorial outreach program were obtained for 160 of the 390 children served (Mohan, 1975). "The t values . . . were calculated on the basis of differences between predicted and actual posttest scores" (p. 31). It was found that migrant children in grades four through secondary level showed greater growth on independent and instructional reading. The results for primary children "though not found to be statistically significant, were in the positive direction" (p. 35).

There have been changes in both programs since 1975, but they have been relatively minor, Florida dropped the

tutorial designation from its title calling it simply the language arts program (LAP) but it retained the tutorial approach. Gains continued to surpass the expected objectives of 1.5 months per 20 hours of instruction in subsequent years (Scruggs, 1977).

In New York the tutorial outreach program had grown from one outreach center at Fredonia to ten TOPS centers serving approximately 3,000 children (Thompson, 1977, p. 6). Gains that far exceeded expectations showed that migrant students made "gains well above one-month of achievement for one-month of instruction in a TOPS program" (p. 6).

In Florida record keeping was given credit as an important part of the success of the FMCCP (FSDE, 1975). A vital service was provided by the migrant student record transfer system because the system quickly transmitted student information between schools and throughout the states. The situation was much the same in New York. Thompson (1976) reported that workshops were conducted in New York to explain to tutors how the MSRTS functioned to help migrant children. The TOPS tutors kept records which promoted self-confidence and a sense of achievement in school among the migrant children who participated in the New York program (Thompson, 1977). The compilation of the reading skills list was an attempt to simplify the recording of progress in reading on the MSRTS so that tutors and teachers could better use its services to promote continuity.

Reading Skills

The codification of the reading skills for the Migrant Education Program was a cooperative venture of the Migrant Branch of USOE, the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education, the MSRTS, and 11 states. The Eastern Stream was represented by the chair state (New York), Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Puerto Rico over the three year period it took to complete the list.

As migrant children transferred from place to place teachers recorded what they had been working on in the appropriate code for the MSRTS report (Bove, 1979). According to Bove, chairman of the reading skills committee, reading reports encompassed a myriad of reading systems, programs, materials, and tests that many of the teachers had never used or did not know how to interpret. The reading skills committee developed a method for teachers to use to report individual progress in reading (Bove, 1979).

The decision to compile a list of skills was discussed earlier in this chapter. Bove (1979) reported that the final skills list included 47 concepts, each of which "would be both generic and universal" (p. 8). The skills were basic enough to be found in a variety of reading programs if some system of reporting them could be employed. The committee subdivided the skills and labeled them to simplify the process of coding them for the computer.

The committee produced a manual of definitions and sub-skills all cross-referenced to the 47 skills (Bove, 1979). The manual (National Migrant Education Program, 1979) described the terms used for the MSRTS reading outline. An area was "a collection of Skills under a particular discipline" (p. 1). In reading there were three major areas, (a) decoding, (b) comprehension, and (c) study skills.

A topic, as defined in the manual, was "a collection of Skills in one or more Subtopics" (National Migrant Education Program, 1979, p. 1). Concepts grouped under decoding were topics subdivided into four categories, (a) readiness, (b) consonants, (c) vowels, and (d) structural analysis. Under comprehension were placed, (a) literal, (b) inferential, and (c) vocabulary. There was one topic under study skills which was called reading in the content areas. Everything placed under a subtopic was considered to be a skill. A skill was "a discrete observable unit of student behavior" (National Migrant Education Program, 1979, p. 1).

The manual helped the teacher to interpret the skills by clarifying the meaning of the key terms (Bove, 1979). The National Migrant Education Program (1979) manual presented the following definitions.

> Decoding. The act of associating the symbol with the sound of the word and its associated meaning: Reading. (p. 7)
>
> Comprehension. The ability to understand, to think, and to obtain meaning. (p. 12)

Study skills. The application of all reading skills in the total school curriculum. (p. 19)

To help the receiving teacher decide where to place the child in the concept indicated by the sending teacher the reading skills committee constructed an instructional level guide (Bove, 1979). There are four levels, Kindergarten (K-1), Primary (1-3), Intermediate (4-6), and Secondary (7-12), listed in the manual (The National Migrant Education Program, 1979).

The manual was printed in both English and Spanish because "approximately 65 percent of the migrant children in this country are of Hispanic origin" (Bove, 1979, p. 9). Bove observed that neither language was a translation of the other but expressed the reading concepts inherent in each culture.

Bove (1979) explained that the success or failure of the new reporting method hinged on the sending teacher's judgment. It was the instructor's responsibility to describe the concepts the child was working on and the instructional level at which the child was performing to help the receiving teacher. The primary purpose of the migrant student record transfer system academic report, Bove noted, was to assist the teacher in the initial placement of the incoming child. The receiving teacher could adapt his/her methods and materials to either continue in the same concepts at the same level or make a new assessment of the child's skill needs.

The assessment of student progress in reading, according to the Bove (1979) review, should not be confused with the skills list report. The teacher must still use diagnostic and prescriptive tools to measure and evaluate student needs in reading. The committee, through the report of its chairman (Bove), cautioned users to remember that the reading skills list was not created as a reading program, a national curriculum guide, or even a complete compilation of skills.

The reading skills report was made available through regional workshops in the spring of 1979, after having been field tested and revised in the states represented by the reading committee (Bove, Note 2). The workshops were produced in seven states across the nation. Georgia and Pennsylvania were the states chosen for the Eastern Stream Region (Bove, Note 2).

The system has not been in operation long enough to assess its effectiveness. However, key personnel in USOE, the National Association of State Directors, and the MSRTS have planned to update training opportunities (Bove, Note 2). In Bove's opinion (Note 2) eventually the major publishing companies may permit cross-referencing of skills in their reading textbooks to be identified by the computer, and thus have them accessible to the teacher who must plan how to relate what is being done in the classroom to the report of reading progress for each individual migrant child (Bove, Note 2).

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, PROJECTION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was started as 1979 was drawing to an end. It was written as the new year began not only another year, but a new decade as well. A new beginning stimulated reflection upon the past. America had undergone many changes since 1965, and unquestionably would undergo many more in the 1980s. Television and media exposure threatened to create a country where everyone was to buy the same products, watch the same programs, and perhaps pursue the same goals. But the migrant population was not part of that mainstream because of their mobility. Their needs could no longer be ignored by an affluent society. This study focused on the needs of migrant children whose transient lifestyle disrupted their schooling, and interrupted their reading progress.

Summary

The purpose of this study as outlined in Chapter One was to trace the development of selected approaches to provide continuity in reading progress for individual migrant children. The problem of continuity and sequencing of reading skills was examined, as well as the related problems of transmittal of school records and record keeping procedures.

This study attempted to place in historic perspective the development of the MSRTS and the codification of the National Migrant Education Program Reading Skills.

In Chapter Two the migrant population was described in terms of ethnic structure which changed over the 14 year period examined. Of the three migratory patterns in the United States, the Eastern Stream was selected as the one most relevant for this study. It was found that the disadvantaged background and circumstances inherent in the migrant lifestyle produced characteristics common to migrant children collectively. Although the emphasis was on the individual student whose needs were diverse, it was shown that individuals also shared similar needs in education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and its subsequent amendments were the subject matter of Chapter Three. The Act defined what was meant by the term "disadvantaged," and a year later who was eligible to be categorized as a migrant. Purposes were established by law, programs were designed, and funds were allocated to achieve the aims of the education amendments of the 1960s. The amendments of the 1970s reflected the restrictions of the times, demanded assessment and evaluation, and displayed growing distrust in all facets of government.

The problem of record keeping and transferral from school to school had been recognized for many years. It remained for advancement in computerized technology, interstate

cooperation, and adequate funding to bring to fruition the migrant student record transfer system. It was the development of the MSRTS that made possible for the first time the method by which continuity of educational services could be attained.

Chapter Four was concerned with assessing the needs in the area of reading as one strand in the language arts program. This study looked at what constituted reading, accepted the position of the National Migrant Education Program Reading Skills Committee that reading skills were the essence of the reading program and discussed how those reading skills were measured. The study showed that skill needs were diagnosed and prescriptions were written to provide remediation through tutorial programs.

Two tutorial programs were selected to demonstrate how interstate cooperation between a sending state (Florida) and a receiving state (New York) improved continuity of instruction in the acquisition of reading skills for the individual migrant child. This study compared the language arts tutorial (LAT) and the tutorial outreach program (TOP) plans according to rationale, goals and objectives, the students served, staff composition and training, and program evaluation.

The codification of the reading skills was seen as an attempt to simplify the reporting procedures that indicated reading progress on the MSRTS so that teachers could utilize its services to provide continuity. The skills were arranged

to include 47 concepts, which were subdivided into three main areas, which were further subdivided into eight topics. The skills manual defined all the terms used to guarantee comprehensive agreement. The skills list was designed to rely on the teacher to check the skills and instructional level on which the child was working when he/she left the classroom. The primary purpose of the report was to provide the receiving teacher with background information to begin instruction, so the child would be able to continue in a skill area in which he/she was working until such time as a new diagnosis was prescribed. The MSRTS provided the method by which the transferral of records could be accomplished with little delay. The codification of reading skills presented the teacher with a simplified reporting procedure to better utilize its services to promote continuity for the migrant child.

Projection

The migrant program was conceived to fulfill a need for continuity of educational services for the children of a mobile population. The vehicle for this was provided in the development of the MSRTS which was honored during the national bicentennial as one of the 10 most effective projects in the country (Miller, Note 1). Its effectiveness as a data collection system was recognized by Congress in 1974. Its services are projected to extend to other mobile

populations in the future. .Rivera (Note 3) suggested that military personnel who are also highly mobile are studying the system for its feasibility for their children's educational needs.

The success of experiments in program design such as TOPS has led to expansion in areas beyond reading, and to populations other than migrant children (Thompson, 1977). Neglected and delinquent youth are being tutored according to TOPS procedures. Thompson (1977) projected that programs "to reach illiterate rural adults, handicapped, and Native Americans may be able to utilize the management strengths apparent in TOPS" (p. 8) to aid scattered populations.

Recommendations

There is a need for future research in two areas that are related to this study. First, the writer recommends that more research needs to be done on mobility as it affects reading achievement for non-migrants. The Bollenbacher (1962) and Snipes (1966) studies were the only ones identified by the writer that related to this recommendation. The writer found that neither study was conclusive nor applicable to a larger population. However, one of the problems in studying mobility is the difficulty of isolating it from the other problems mobile populations experience that may not be related to mobility itself.

A second area for further research is the need to evaluate the reading skills program when it has been in use an adequate length of time. Examination might center on how the teachers are using the skills list other than for initial placement purposes, whether it has merit for other children who need skills reinforcement but who are not mobile, and whether the skills list as currently designed is a practical approach in view of the time it takes to extract instructional strategy from a variety of materials.

REFERENCES

After ten years of progress, then what in migrant education? A report. Richmond: Virginia State Department of Education, 1976.

Alford, A. Education's new landmark legislation. American Education, 1972, 8 (7), 4-8.

Alford, A. The education amendments of 1974. American Education, 1975, 11 (1), 6-11.

Alford, A. The education amendments of 1978. American Education, 1979, 15 (9), 6-14.

Badaracca, G. Pilot V needs assessment: A study conducted during the year 1972 to ascertain data as the basis of curriculum development for migrant children. Educational Resources Information Center, 1972, ED 091 129.

Biller, J. & Meredith, W. Markham: Report of the evaluation of an educational program, 1968-70. Educational Resources Information Center, 1970, ED 047 053.

Bloom, B. (Ed.). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain. New York: McKay, 1956.

Bloom, B., Hastings, J. & Madaus, G. Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bollenbacher, J. A study of the effect of mobility on reading achievement. Reading Teacher, 1962, 15, 356-360; 365.

Bove, R. The teacher and the reading skills report for migrant students. Educational Resources Information Center, 1979, ED 170 078.

California State Department of Education. Education for farm migrant children: Report on the six-state project for developing state leadership in improving the educational opportunities of farm migrant children. Educational Resources Information Center, 1971, ED 061 006.

page 62. Blank

Clymer, T. What is reading?: Some current concepts. In A. Harris & E. Sipay (Eds.). Readings on reading instruction (2nd ed.). New York: McKay, 1972.

Coles, R. Uprooted children: The early life of migrant farm workers. University of Pittsburg Press: 1970.

Conklin, N. Identifying the disabled reader. In D. DeBoer (Ed.). Reading diagnosis and evaluation. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1970.

Crenshaw, J. Handbook for the Florida migratory child compensatory program. Educational Resources Information Center, 1967, ED 015 032.

Curtis, H. & Caputo, E. Florida agricultural migrant right-to-read program: A suggested set of objectives. Educational Resources Information Center, 1971, ED 068 904.

Dyer, M. The changing MSRTS: Part 1. The Migrant Educator, 1977, 3 (12), 2; 4.

Dyer, M. The changing MSRTS: Part 2. The Migrant Educator, 1978, 4 (1), 2; 8.

Edwards, E. Children of migratory agricultural workers in the public elementary schools of the United States: Needs and proposals in the area of curriculum. Harvard Educational Review, 1960, 30, 12-52.

Ekwall, E. Diagnosis and remediation of the disabled reader. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1977.

Exotech Systems, Inc. Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title I programs for migrant children of migrant agricultural workers. (Vol. 1 Executive summary) Educational Resources Information Center, 1974, ED 093 524.

Farr, R. Reading: What can be measured? Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1969.

The first work of these times: A description and analysis of the elementary and secondary education act of 1965. American Education, 1965, 4 (4), 13-20.

Florida State Department of Education. Florida migratory child compensatory program. Educational Resources Information Center, 1975, ED 121 507.

Friedland, W. & Nelkin, D. Migrant: Agricultural workers in America's Northeast. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Frohlicher, J. Elementary and secondary education amendments of 1969. American Education, 1970, 6 (6), 7-9.

Fuller, V. No work today! The plight of America's migrants. (Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 190). New York: Public Affairs Commission, 1953.

Grants to states for migrant children. American Education, 1971, 7 (5), 32.

Greene, S. The education of migrant children. Washington, D.C.: Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, 1954.

Hogan, P. Improving the education of migrant children. American Education, 1973, 9 (3), 20-24.

Karlin, R. Teaching elementary reading: Principles and strategies. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1975 (2nd ed.).

Kleinert, E. The Florida migrant. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, 51 (2), 90-93.

Lapp, D. The use of behavioral objectives in education. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1972.

Markham Elementary School. Communication skills program. Educational Resources Information Center, 1967, ED 037 263.

Mattera, G. & Steel, E. Exemplary programs for migrant children. Educational Resources Information Center, 1974, ED 092 278.

Mehrens, W. & Lehmann, I. Standardized tests in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Miller, J. Love and understanding of the migrant child. Educational Resources Information Center, 1969, ED 038 200.

Miller, W. The first r: Elementary reading today. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

Mohan, M. Evaluation of the Fredonia outreach program. Educational Resources Information Center, 1975, ED 148 508.

Moore, T. The slaves we rent. New York: Random House, 1965.

Morales, H. From their hands, a feast. American Education, 1965, 1 (10), 1-5.

National migrant education program: Reading skills, English & Spanish. Austin, Tx.: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., 1979.

Nelson, N. Migrant education in New York State. New York State Education, 1966, 53 (8), 11-12.

Park, J. Children who follow the sun. Today's Education, 1976, 65 (1), 53-56.

Pfeil, M. Computer harvests migrant records. American Education, 1970, 6 (9), 6-9.

Puentes, C. The data bank system. Love and understanding of the migrant child. Educational resources Information Center, 1969, ED 038 200.

Random House dictionary of the English language. New York: Random House, 1967.

Ribovich, J. Teaching reading fifty years ago. Reading Teacher, 1978, 31 (4), 371-375.

Rivera, V. The importance of migrant education. Love and understanding of the migrant child. Educational Resources Information Center, 1969, ED 038 200.

Ruddell, R. Reading-language instruction: Innovative practices. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Scruggs, J. Florida migratory child compensatory program evaluation, FY 1977. Educational Resources Information Center, 1977, ED 156 387.

Shotwell, L. The harvesters: The story of the migrant people. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.

Smith, F. Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978 (2nd ed.).

Smith, J., Smith, D. & Brink, J. A technology of reading and writing: Criterion-referenced tests for reading and writing. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Smith, N. Reading instruction for today's children. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Snipes, W. The effect of moving on reading achievement. Reading Teacher, 1966, 20 (3), 242-246.

Strang, R. Reading diagnosis and remediation. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1968.

Sutton, E. Knowing and teaching the migrant child. Washington, D.C.: Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, 1960.

Sutton, E. Models of interstate cooperation: What? Why? How? Planning Florida's migrant education program. Educational Resources Information Center, 1966, ED 011 471.

Tancredi, L. Methods geared for teaching the migrant. In A. Pinnie (Ed.). Another disadvantaged dimension: Educating the migrant child. Educational Resources Information Center, 1969, ED 041 085.

Thompson, T. Providing opportunities: Report of the fiscal 1974 program for the education of children of migratory agricultural workers in New York State. Educational Resources Information Center, 1974, ED 115 413.

Thompson, T. Migrant education 76: Report of the fiscal 1976 program for the education of children of migrant farmworkers in New York State. Educational Resources Information Center, 1976, ED 147 060.

Thompson, T. Individualized instruction for N.Y. migrant children. The Migrant Educator, 1977, 3 (7), 4; 6-8.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Report of Title I ESEA migrant coodinators meeting. Educational Resources Information Center, 1968, ED 039 056.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Questions and answers: Program for migrant children under ESEA Title I (No. 37067). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare. History of Title I ESEA (No. 7275). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Handbook on performance objectives: Title I ESEA (No. 73-07103). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Migrant student record transfer system. Oversight hearings on migrant education programs. Educational Resources Information Center, 1976, ED 122 984.

U.S. Office of Education. Children at the crossroad (No. 37062). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. statutes at large (Vol. 79). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

U.S. statutes at large (Vol. 80). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. statutes at large (Vol. 81). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

U.S. statutes at large (Vol. 86). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

U.S. statutes at large (Vol. 88). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Wey, H. & Cheyney, A. National goals for migrant education. In A. Cheyney (Ed.). The ripe harvest: Educating migrant children. Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1972.

What's new in the ESEA amendments. American Education, 1967, 3 (2), 18-20.

Wright, D. They harvest despair: The migrant farmworker. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.